



MG ZS
Standard Safety Equipment

2017



Adult Occupant



71%

Child Occupant



51%

VRU Impact Protection



59%

Safety Assist



29%

SPECIFICATION

Tested Model	MG ZS
Body Type	- 5 door SUV
Year Of Publication	2017
Kerb Weight	1204kg
VIN From Which Rating Applies	- all ZSs
Class	Small Family Car

X Rating Expired

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

	Driver	Passenger	Rear
FRONTAL CRASH PROTECTION			
Frontal airbag	●	●	✘
Belt pretensioner	●	●	✘
Belt loadlimiter	●	●	✘
Knee airbag	✘	✘	✘
SIDE CRASH PROTECTION			
Side head airbag	●	●	●
Side chest airbag	●	●	✘
Side pelvis airbag	●	●	✘
	Driver	Passenger	Rear
CHILD PROTECTION			
Isofix/i-Size	—	✘	●
Integrated CRS	—	✘	✘
Airbag cut-off switch	—	●	—
SAFETY ASSIST			
Seat Belt Reminder	●	●	✘

SAFETY EQUIPMENT (NEXT)

	Driver	Passenger	Rear
CHILD PROTECTION			
Isofix/i-Size	—	✘	●
Integrated CRS	—	✘	✘
Airbag cut-off switch	—	●	—
SAFETY ASSIST			
Seat Belt Reminder	●	●	✘

OTHER SYSTEMS	
Active Bonnet (Hood)	✘
AEB Pedestrian	✘
AEB City	✘
AEB Inter-Urban	✘
Speed Assistance System	●
Lane Assist System	✘

Note: Other equipment may be available on the vehicle but was not considered in the test year.

- Fitted to the vehicle as standard
 ○ Fitted to the vehicle as part of the safety pack
○ Not fitted to the test vehicle but available as option or as part of the safety pack
 ✘ Not available — Not applicable

ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 27.3 Pts / 71%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Frontal Offset Deformable Barrier 6.1 Pts

Passenger Driver

Frontal Full Width 3.9 Pts

Rear Passenger Driver

Whiplash Rear Impact 1.3 Pts

Front seat Rear seat

Lateral Impact 16.0 Pts

Car Pole

AEB City 0.0

Performance:



ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 27.3 Pts / 71%



GOOD



ADEQUATE



MARGINAL



WEAK



POOR



ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 27.3 Pts / 71%

Comments

The passenger compartment of the ZS remained stable in the frontal offset test. Dummy readings indicated good protection of the knees and femurs of the driver and passenger but structures in the dashboard were thought to present a risk to occupants of different sizes and to those sat in different positions. In the full-width rigid barrier test, readings of chest compression in the rear passenger dummy indicated poor protection for this part of the body and protection of the head was rated as marginal, based on measured decelerations. In both the side barrier test and the more severe side pole impact, protection of all critical body areas was good and the ZS scored maximum points in these tests. Tests on the front seats and head restraints demonstrated marginal protection against whiplash injuries in the event of a rear-end collision. A geometric assessment of the rear seats also indicated marginal whiplash protection.



CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 25.1 Pts / 51%

GOOD
 ADEQUATE
 MARGINAL
 WEAK
 POOR

Crash Test Performance based on 6 & 10 year old children

9.6 Pts



Restraint for 6 year old child: *Britax Römer Kidfix XP*
 Restraint for 10 year old child: *Graco Junior III*

Safety Features

5.0 Pts

	Front Passenger	2nd row outboard	2nd row center
Isofix	✘	●	✘
i-Size	✘	●	✘
Integrated CRS	✘	✘	✘

Fitted to test car as standard
 Not on test car but available as option
 ✘ Not available

CRS Installation Check

10.5 Pts

● Install without problem
 ● Install with care
 ● Safety critical problem
 ✘ Installation not allowed

■ i-Size CRS



■ ISOFIX CRS



CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 25.1 Pts / 51%

- Universal Belted CRS

Maxi Cosi Cabriofix (Belt)



Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyBase2 (Belt)



Britax Römer King II LS (Belt)



Britax Römer KidFix XP (Belt)



Comments

In the frontal offset test, protection of the neck of the 10 year dummy was rated as poor, based on measured values of tensile forces. Protection of the chest was marginal. For the 6 year dummy, protection of the chest and neck was weak, based on decelerations and tensile forces. In the side barrier test, the head of the 10 year dummy 'bottomed out' the airbag and injury criteria indicated poor protection for this part of the body. The front passenger airbag can be disabled to allow a rearward-facing dummy to be used in that seating position. Clear information is provided to the driver regarding the status of the airbag and the system was rewarded. There was insufficient seatbelt length to install Universal restraints properly in the front passenger seat. The same was true for one Universal seat in the rear centre seat and one other was unstable when installed. Otherwise, restraints could be properly installed and accommodated.

CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 25.1 Pts / 51%

	Seat Position			
	Front	2nd row		
	PASSENGER	LEFT	CENTER	RIGHT
Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (rearward) (iSize)	—	●	—	●
Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (forward) (iSize)	—	●	—	●
BeSafe iZi Kid X2 i-Size (iSize)	—	●	—	●
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & FamilyFix (ISOFIX)	—	●	—	●
BeSafe iZi Kid X4 ISOfix (ISOFIX)	—	●	—	●
Britax Römer Duo Plus (ISOFIX)	—	●	—	●
Britax Römer KidFix XP (ISOFIX)	—	●	—	●
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix (Belt)	●	●	●	●
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyBase2 (Belt)	●	●	✘	●
Britax Römer King II LS (Belt)	●	●	●	●
Britax Römer KidFix XP (Belt)	●	●	●	●

● Easy ● Difficult ● Safety critical ✘ Not allowed — Not available

Comments

In the frontal offset test, protection of the neck of the 10 year dummy was rated as poor, based on measured values of tensile forces. Protection of the chest was marginal. For the 6 year dummy, protection of the chest and neck was weak, based on decelerations and tensile forces. In the side barrier test, the head of the 10 year dummy 'bottomed out' the airbag and injury criteria indicated poor protection for this part of the body. The front passenger airbag can be disabled to allow a rearward-facing dummy to be used in that seating position. Clear information is provided to the driver regarding the status of the airbag and the system was rewarded. There was insufficient seatbelt length to install Universal restraints properly in the front passenger seat. The same was true for one Universal seat in the rear centre seat and one other was unstable when installed. Otherwise, restraints could be properly installed and accommodated.

VRU IMPACT PROTECTION

Total 25.1 Pts / 59%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

VRU Impact Protection	25.1 Pts						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Head Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">17.0 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pelvis Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">2.1 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Leg Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">6.0 Pts</td> </tr> </table>	Head Impact	17.0 Pts	Pelvis Impact	2.1 Pts	Leg Impact	6.0 Pts
Head Impact	17.0 Pts						
Pelvis Impact	2.1 Pts						
Leg Impact	6.0 Pts						

AEB Pedestrian 0.0 Pts

Comments

The bonnet provided protection that was predominantly good or adequate to the head of a struck pedestrian. The bumper offered good protection to pedestrians' legs but protection of the pelvis was mostly poor.

 SAFETY ASSIST

Total 3.5 Pts / 29%

GOOD
 ADEQUATE
 MARGINAL
 WEAK
 POOR

Speed Assistance

1.5 Pts

System Name	Active Speed Limit (ASL) system
Speed Limit Information Function	N/A
Warning Function	Manually set
Speed Limitation Function	Manually set (accurate to 5km/h)

Seatbelt Reminder

2.0 Pts

Applies To	Front seats		
	Driver Seat	Front Passenger(s)	Rear Passenger(s)
Warning			
Visual	●	●	—
Audible	●	●	—

● Pass
 ● Fail
 — Not available

Lane Support

0 Pts

AEB Inter-Urban

0 Pts



SAFETY ASSIST

Total 3.5 Pts / 29%

Comments

The ZS has a seatbelt reminder for the front seats only. A driver-set speed limiter is also standard equipment.

RATING VALIDITY

Variants of Model Range

Body Type	Engine & Transmission	Model Name/Code	Drivetrain	Rating Applies	
				LHD	RHD
5 door SUV	1.5 petrol	MG ZS 1.5 DOHC VTI-Tech*	4 x 2	✓	✓
5 door SUV	1.0 petrol	MG ZS 1.0 Turbo	4 x 2	✓	✓

*Tested variant

Annual Reviews and Facelifts

Date	Event	Outcome
December 2017	Rating Published	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓
December 2018	Annual Review	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓
December 2019	Annual Review	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓
July 2020	Facelift Review	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓
December 2020	Annual Review	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓
September 2021	Facelift Review	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓
December 2022	Annual Review	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓